

United States Patent and Trademark Office <

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/752,199	12/29/2000	Dean Throop	40921/250098	40921/250098 8124	
26108	7590 08/25/2006		EXAMINER		
	DANIELS & VERDON GENERATION PLAZA	SCHNEIDER, JOSHUA D			
	IGHWAY 54 EAST	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
DURHAM, NC 27713			2182		
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/752,199	THROOP, DEAN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Joshua D. Schneider	2182	

	Joshua D. Schneider	2182						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 14 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing								
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since					
AMENDMENTS		21						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 								
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		maliant Amandmant	(DTOL 224)					
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		impliant Amendment	(F10L-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,8-17 and 19-27</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ls to provide a					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)						
TAMMARA PEYTON PRIMARY EXAMINER								
	King an							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new limitations to eliminate the involvement of the server would require a new consideration of the claims in view of the specification. The claims would have to be read against the specification to determine to what extent the lack of server interaction extends. The arguments set for the by the applicant seem to assert that the claims would never allow for the server interaction with a process at some time prior to the beginning of the process claimed.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not argued against the rejection to show any missing element or improper rational. The rejection as previously set forth seems to teach all the required elements. Though the invention taught by the reference may also require additional elements, this is not differentiating given the open language of the claims. It would seem that the connection, sending and returning action os steps b, c, and d are all accomplished without the use of the server, though the peripheral is configured by the server before these interactions occur.